

REMARKS

In the first office action, claims 1 to 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lo et al (US 2001/0041945) in view of Rombom et al (US 6,104,292) and claims 4 to 20 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The first office action also indicates that claims 4 to 20 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Rather than amending claim 4 to include the limitations of claims 1 to 3, claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claims 2, 3 and 4 and should be in condition for allowance. Claims 5 to 8 have been amended to make claims 5 to 8 dependent upon amended claim 1. Accordingly claims 5 to 8 should also be in condition for allowance and the allowance of amended claims 1 and 5 to 8 is solicited.

Claim 18 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance. To keep the number of independent claims to a minimum, claims 9 to 12 have been amended to make these claims dependent upon amended claim 18. Accordingly claims 9 to 12 should also be in condition for allowance and the allowance of amended claims 18 and 9 to 12 is solicited.

Claim 19 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance. To keep the number of independent claims to a minimum, claims 13 to 16 have been amended to make these claims dependent upon amended claim 19. Accordingly claims 13 to 16 should also be in condition for allowance and the allowance of amended claims 19 and 13 to 16 is solicited.

Claims 17 and 20 have each been amended to include the limitations of claim 1 and should be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the allowance of amended claims 17 and 20 is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant

John D. Lister
Registration No. 23,004
(480) 641-7459